UNITY.

A Pamphlet Mission for

Freedom, Fellowship and Character in Religion.

Published Semi-Monthly, 75 Madison St., Chicago. | February 15, 1879. | Vol. 2. No. 12. | Price, 10 Cents. Per Year, $1.50.

Science and Religion:

WHAT ATTITUDE SHOULD THEY HOLD TO ONE ANOTHER?

BY REV. JAMES T. BIXBY.

The conflict now going on between the physical discoveries and theories of these latter days, and the forms of faith which have hitherto ruled the mind of Christendom, is one of the most noticeable phenomena of the intellectual movement of the day. It is a fact too notorious to need the specification of any particular instances out of the host every week presented, and it is an antagonism too injurious to both parties concerned not to call for all possible efforts at a better understanding between them. "The problem of our age" as Archdeacon Hare has well said, "is to reconcile faith with knowledge, philosophy with religion. The men of our age will not believe until you prove to them that what they are called upon to believe, does not contradict the laws of their minds, and that it rests upon a solid and unshaken foundation."

Nor can science, either, carry on its work with the impartiality of spirit, equanimity of temper and singleness and elevation of purpose needed, until this supposed antagonism of religion has ceased. To bring these two poles of modern thought into harmonious relations with each other, is a work of prime import-

For fuller illustration of his thought and evidence for his positions the author refers the reader to his work—"Similarities of Physical and Religious Knowledge," published by D. Appleton & Co., New York.

ance. On it depends the integrity and coördination of these two factors of man's higher existence, the aspirations of his soul and the perceptions of his intellect, for the development of which all other things are but instrumentalities.

How can this be effected? Not by smoothing over any real difficulties, not by bridging any natural chasms, or accommodating or compromising any inherent antagonisms. Such work is always useless if not mischievous. Nor is it to be brought about by doing what so many have essayed,—by showing detailed coincidences or particular correspondences between the present results of science and the testimony of the scriptures; by demonstrating how the six days of creation answer to the epochs of modern geology, by exhibiting the agreement of ethnography with man's descent from a single couple; by illustrating by modern hygiene the wisdom of the Levitical regulations, or by disclosing in expressions of Job, or David or Isaiah, anticipations of modern discoveries. A flexile and ingenious interpreter, not over scrupulous about twisting words and forcing facts, can always do this. As Prof. Huxley has said, "One never knows what exegetic ingenuity may make of the original Hebrew." Each past generation has found in the grand store-house of the Bible its favorite theories, however singular and contradictory; in Tertullian's age, the materiality of the soul; in Angustine's, the flatness of the earth; in the time of the schoolmen, the Aristotelian philosophy; fifty years ago, the cataclysmal systems of geology and the Cuvierian distinctions of species; to-day, it is but little more difficult to find there authority or allowance for the nebular hypothesis, the evolution theory, and the savage if not animal origin of man; tomorrow again, whatever newer discovery Science may imagine it has made. The hunting up of such correspondences is of very little value for any permanent reconciliation of science and religion. The closer the coincidence happens to be between the Bible and any given branch of science in the positions that it holds to-day, the sooner it is likely that disagreement will be revealed by the advancement of science, and the present inter-

pretation of the sacred text become obsolete and require revision. The continual varying of her interpretation and shifting of her ground to which these Bible-harmonizers are driven, as they follow the advancing footsteps of science, inevitably throws discredit upon religion. It makes faith appear as a dependent, obliged to science for permission to live, or as a satellite reflecting the varying phases of the scientific primary, rather than as an independent power, the central, self-subsisting Sun of Righteousness. The only true and permanent method of putting an end to the traditional feud between science and religion is, instead, to look at them in their broadest and most essential features and thus learn the underlying unities of physical and religious knowledge; the common foundations on which they really rest, the similiarities of methods, objects and general results, which exist between them, and the actual identity of interests which bind them together and which should be acknowledged in word, thought and action.

Is there any necessary antagonism between science and religion? An apparent and *de facto* conflict exists and has existed for centuries. Is there any *de jure* conflict? For my part, I say *no*, and whoever will look straight at them, endeavoring to distinguish them from the many other things which have borne their names, will also I believe, say no.

Let us see just what they are.

Science signifies:

1. In its broader sense, *all systematized and trustworthy* knowledge.

2. In its narrower and more special sense, *that* portion of systematized and certain *knowledge which can be gained by a study of the physical universe.*

Religion has also two main significations.

1. In its most general significance, it is *the expression of man's spiritual nature unfolding to spiritual truths and influences.*

As the spiritual nature manifests itself in the various channels of the human organism, this expression takes in various

forms, as beliefs, sentiments, aspirations, worship. It varies in quality and quantity. In some, especially in savage races, it is gross and feeble; in others, intense, pure and lofty.

2. In the more special sense of religion, it is limited to the particular beliefs or knowledges attained to in this unfolding of the spiritual nature. Some are essential, some inessential. The following three only, I regard as necessary to the very existence of religion.

1. Belief in a soul within man.
2. In a sovereign over soul without.
3. In actual or possible relations between them.

Now, if this, substantially, is what we mean by science and religion, there is no rightful antagonism between them.

Looking at the relations of the two from the point of view of the first definition of science, then religion, in its first signification, would be just a part of the facts which science is to study and systematize. The sentiments of gratitude and aspirations, the peculiarities of worship, the forms of belief which religious history exhibits, are just as much phenomena of the world, just as much facts of the Kosmos, as the markings of a flower or the transformation of a butterfly. Nay, they are the noblest and most significant of phenomena, and science could never claim to be complete, if it did not receive them as a subject of inquiry and systematization. The result of such an inquiry and systematization of spiritual facts would constitute religious science. Religion in the more special sense,—the particular knowledges or beliefs attained to by the awakening of man's spiritual nature, more or less coincides with this, and forms a subdivision of science, just in the degree that its doctrines are valid and systematically coördinated with each other and the facts which were their data. Nominally, then, science is not complete till religion, in its general signification becomes one of its objects of investigation, and in its special signification becomes a part of science itself. If the phenomena of religion appear at first sight incongruous with other phenomena, they are not therefore to be denied or ignored or ridiculed; but

studied with the more care, as likely to reveal new laws and causes. If the laws and causes at present assigned to them seem erroneously inferred, it is the business of science to assist religion in making a better systematization of the facts.

Looking at the question, next, from the stand-point of the more special sense of science,—"the systematized knowledge derived from a study of the physical universe," then, religion would to a certain extent stand outside of the field of science. They would each have in a certain sense, separate domains, or rather separate beginnings and points of view. They would not then be antagonistic, but supplementary. If now, looking at different realms of the Kosmos, they should come to different results on any question, (*e. g.* such as the existence of the soul,) that would not be strange. When the subject of study, as in this case, is complex and many sided, it is not to be wondered at if they who approach it from different quarters and with different instruments, should see different aspects. The positive testimony of both would have to be received and united as well as might be. But negative testimony from one side would be of no avail to contradict the positive testimony of the other. The fact that the eye sees no odor come from the flower establishes no antagonism between its testimony and that of the olfactory organ that smells it. If physical science reports that neither by the balance, the dissecting knife nor the lens, it has found trace of any spiritual being, this no more disproves the direct testimony of the religious faculties, that by their methods and organs they *do* find it, than the inability of the intuitive faculties to apprehend the laws of motion or the forces of electricity and gravitation, disprove the testimony of science to them. The word of each is good for its own account in its own sphere. Contradiction and necessary antagonism would arise only by one establishing the non-existence of the other's domain, and the entire fictitiousness of the sources of knowledge that it claims,—a thing which either of the two would have to step squarely outside of its own proper field even to begin to attempt. Modern physical science, especially, could not right-

fully essay this, for one of its cardinal principles is the unity of the whole universe, the truth and reality, at bottom, of all persistent forces. Some men of science, it is true, from the inability of their own processes as yet to fathom the mystery of the world, deny that *any* method or faculty can fathom it. But this is an unscientific assumption, not in accordance with the true spirit of modern research. The faith of science is that progress in knowledge is unending. To identify the limit where progress is at present arrested, with the absolute limit of possible knowledge, is opposed to the principles of modern inquiry. Nor if science concludes that its own methods and instruments are unavailing to reach religious truth, is that a reason for rejecting also the testimony which the spiritual faculties have from of old given to spiritual things? Rather it is an admonition to the earnest seeker to turn in preference to this other oracle as the proper interpreter of the divine mysteries and the better guide to its treasures.

From the scientific stand-point, then, there is no rightful quarrel between science and religion. Is there any from the religious stand-point? What is there in this expression of man's spiritual nature, in any of its legitimate manifestations, that demands of it to draw a sword against knowledge of any kind? Which one of these expressions of the spiritual nature is it that needs to fight physical science? Is it love, aspiration, reverence, self-sacrifice, or any other of the religious sentiments? Is it philanthrophy, purity, justice, consecration, or any other element of the spiritual life? Surely, none of these may justly combat science. Nor has the intellectual expression of the spiritual nature, the fundamental beliefs which in a special sense are called religion, any better reason for opposition to science. For the religious believer, just in proportion to the strength of his belief in the Creative power, the Divine Omnipotence and Omnipresence, must believe that nature is no independent power, man's perception and reasoning faculties no unmeaning or deceptive instruments, but that both physical and human nature are works of God, existing as he wish-

es them to exist, reflecting his mind and purposes, and therefore trustworthy witnesses of him. No opening of men's eyes to the facts of the world; no disclosing of the actual methods and laws of the creation can do any thing else, (so the truly religious should believe) than reveal the more clearly the existence and character of their Maker. It may reveal him as acting in ways that we had not supposed. It may compel theology to revise its schemes. But this revision, religion must look upon as received from God's own hand, and as simply bringing us nearer the divine reality and truth. He who confounds the march of intellect with the operations of the devil, evidently ought to trace his own origin to Satan rather than to believe the word of Scripture that man was made in the image of God, and that God saw all the works that he had made, and behold they were very good. To the intelligent theist, the record which the geologist deciphers in the rocks is a revelation written by the same divine finger as that other revelation which the theologian reads in the Psalms of David or the letters of Paul. To the enlightened Christian there is truth to be learned about God everywhere, in the natural, as well as in the moral universe; and no religious studies can be regarded as complete or satisfactory, that neglect or ignore that grand source of Divine instruction which God's handiwork presents to us.

There can be, then, in truth no rightful collision between science and religon. The fact is that there is but one body of truth and "all its parts," as Milton says, "are unitary." There is but one God and all his manifestations must really be concordant. One truth cannot contradict another truth. If the agreement is not now evident, it will come sooner or later, by means of some higher harmony in which their apparent discrepancies will disappear. If the agreement is absolutely impossible, then it is necessary to conclude, either that the religious doctrine is incomplete, or that the scientific theory is somewhere in error. It is an admonition that it is necessary to enlarge and complete the one, or revise and verify the other.

But though thus there *ought* to be no conflict between sci-

ence and religion, the unfortunate fact is that there *is* one, and in this present actual disagreement between the two, the practical question comes, "What is the cause of the disagreement and how can it be adjusted?" Clearly as it may be shown that there is no real conflict, if all were understood, nevertheless, while all is *not* understood, which shall be held to be right or nearest the right, the authority to whom we should bow?

The causes of the disagreement are doubtless manifold. But the main causes, (I think it pretty plain,) are these.

1st. Ignorance of themselves and ignorance of each other. As Dr. Washburne has well said, "If the clergy could ramble with Mr. Huxley over the glaciers and Mr. Huxley would take an excursion into the fields of Christian history, we should have better clerical sermons and better *lay sermons*.

2d. A confounding of both religion and science with other things. Not a few things that pass for science have no real claim to the title. They are but metaphysical quibbles, probable hypotheses, or conjectures spawned in the fertile fancy of scientific dabblers. Similarly, not a few things are popularly set down as religion which are no more religion than they are science. Church doctrines, theologies, sacred books, philosophic systems, physical theories, the prejudices of ecclesiastical organizations and the obstinacy and egotism of the pious, are all identified with *religion*, and any attack on one is assumed to signify an undermining of the very foundations of faith and morals.

3rd. The claims made by both science and religion of exclusive knowledge and, as a result of this, a rightful supremacy over the other. To whichever one we turn, we find it, while repudiating all desire to originate or keep up any conflict, maintaining, nevertheless, *claims* which inevitably make the two clash. "Religion alone," says Faith, "has the absolute truth. It has received from God as its exclusive possession, an unerring revelation, which is an infallible guide to faith and practice." "I entirely approve of science" says Faith, "as long as she teaches only the truth. But whenever she contradicts the doc-

trine of the Church, then it is plain that she wanders into error and mistakes a false human opinion for the genuine instruction of reason and nature."

Similarly says science, on the other hand: "If you would have certainty, not old wives' fables, come to me; I alone am *Scientia*, real-knowledge; all else is more or less guess-work. The doctrines of theology are but the products of the world's crude infancy. To reach solid truth you must leave Faith's mist-formed *high-priori* road, and use the physicists' methods, observation, induction and verification.

But if we examine the claims of both, we shall find that neither has any valid title to the sovereignty of knowledge.

Religion cannot rightfully claim to be the sole source and possessor of truth, but stands on the same ground of experience, employs the same human faculties, is subject to the same fallible conditions, as science, and in her Divine Message, receives not an exclusive privilege, but one given likewise to her comrade. There is no religious authority or oracle to be found anywhere that in the reception, transmission and diffusion of its word, has been, or could be, entirely independent of human agencies, conditions and elements, and consequently none can be free altogether from human fallibility. If religion forbids us to trust God's own handwriting on the tablets of Nature, how can she expect the present age to accept the revelations which have come down to it through the distorting medium of human faculties? Neither conversely, is knowledge a special privilege of natural science. There is no such marked difference in the methods and results of science on the one hand, and religion on the other, to justify the prevalent contempt or disregard of religion by the devotees of science. Science has a *faith*-basis as well as religion. It uses intuition, authority, evidence, and probable influence, and is often destitute of possible verification. Science, no more than religion, can withhold or does withhold, its belief from the supersensual, the immaterial or the inconceivable. Inexactness, uncertainty and variation in the results of its labors, are

faults found in science, as well as in religion. On the other hand, religion as well as science, has an experimental basis. It grounds itself on observation. It proceeds by induction and it confirms its truths by verifications and provisions.

What then should be the attitude of science and religion to each other? What else ought it to be but that of allies? Each needs the other and should make of it a coadjutor.

Without science to correct and guide it, religion is constantly going astray. The countless excesses and irrationalities of superstition; the varied corruptions of every faith, adoration of stick and stone, lizard or bull; devil worship, witch-craft, orgies of Bacchus, devouring rites of Moloch and unclean sacrifices to Venus, all these illustrate the mournful alienations into which devotion inevitably runs when divorced from understanding. Zeal without knowledge as surely curses the world as with knowledge it blesses it. The connections and purifications from superstition which science has given and can today still better supply, are of the greatest value to religion. Religion should encourage and urge the study of science, rather than forbid it. The whole universe is the embodiment and manifestation of its Creator. Every ray that streams from every star, every leaf that hangs on every tree, each living structure, each moving creature, tells the attentive student something of the thoughts and character of the Divine Artist. Nature, then, to the religious man is God's oldest Testament, his most direct Scripture. The ideas disclosed in it are God's thoughts: natural laws, divine laws; natural history, a chapter of natural theology. To every new investigation of the physicist, religion should say Godspeed. The finding of a *Codex Sinaiticus* should not rejoice the church more than the discovery of a new law in nature. And religion, too, should seek to engraft into itself more of the scientific spirit. Instead of aiming to defend systems already established and to bolster up foregone conclusions, it should go simply with inquiring mind to the simple facts. It should employ more constantly those inductive methods that have brought physical research such rich

harvests. It should gather its evidence from as wide a field as possible, sift it with care, retain only what is fact, discriminate sharply between what is known and what is merely conjectured or hoped for, and verify each theory in some satisfactory way before accepting it as proved. Then, when religion shall have passed its doctrines through such an ordeal, an ordeal that its essential truths I believe are fully able to bear, it will at length become a genuine science and take its stand with the most firmly established.

And similarly, science needs the help and inspiration of religion to fulfill the true measure of its usefulness. Religion without science, is like writing a history without facts; science, without religion, is a biography without a subject. Religion without science is a pyramid without base; science without religion is the pyramid without apex.

No one can earnestly study Nature without taking the first steps on the road of faith. As he traces backward and forward the successive ages of the world, he makes the acquaintance of that which is no less than Eternal. As he meditates the course of outspreading Matter and Space, he recognizes that which is Infinite. As he tracks the restless energies of the Kosmos, he comes to know that which he cannot call less than Omnipotent. Through the multitudinous variety of the Universe he discerns the Unity, on the axis of which all turns, the single centre from which all radiates. In the contemplation of this stupendous power the man of science is absorbed. He believes that all happiness depends upon the knowledge of it and the conforming of men's lives to it. He recognizes himself as bound up with it, and is filled with inexpressible awe, as, in his studies, he enters into its marvellous secrets. "It comes that," as Strauss says, "he demands for his Kosmos the same piety that the devout man of old demanded for his God."

Thus, science imbues its sincere students with the spirit of worship; leads them, if not to the inner, nevertheless to the outer court of religion. Only one more step is needed; that

from the Force to the Cause, from the Law to the Law-giver, to bring them into the temple of God.

And this further step, science ought logically to take. The boast of Bacon that he had taken all knowledge as his province, is the duty of science. To ignore the whole domain of spiritual truth is but half to perform its mission.

Religion has its facts, it must not be forgotten, just as much as science. The immaterial thought, the self-directing will, the sense of right and wrong, the consciousness of moral responsibility, these are facts as much as attraction of magnet or undulation of sound waves. Sublime aspirations, immortal longings which protoplasm cannot account for, heroisms and self-sacrifices not to be explained on the principle of the greatest good of the greatest number; a current in human affairs that runs steadily toward the right, the true and the good,—these also are facts. A complete science ought to study these facts candidly and set forth the logical inductions from them, namely, soul and God. A complete science should take note not only of the verifications of physical doctrines in physical experiences, but of these equally strong verifications in spiritual experience of spiritual truths. It should own the force not only of those native predispositions that assure us of Nature's constancy and matter's indestructibility, but of those ineradicable convictions that asseverate the soul's immortality. It should recognize not only the questioning of the human mind for second causes, but its imperative demand for the First Cause. Does it become science to exert itself so diligently merely to pass from effect to anterior effect, from one law to another law only a little more simple, but never ask what is the prime power on which all depends, the Law-giver behind all laws? Shall it trace with such painstaking assiduity every thread of the Kosmos, each hair-breadth of those exquisite webs of interacting laws, so harmoniously blended, so pervaded with the tokens of the profoundest intelligence, and then when we ask for the weaver of this infinite marvel, the Reality behind this veil, tell us there is none, the VEIL is *all*? No. The

true man of science must work with that conviction under which Whewell says he wrote his Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences, that no philosophy of the universe can satisfy the minds of thoughtful men which does not deal with such questions as inevitably force themselves upon our notice respecting the Author and the object of the Universe; and also under the conviction that every philosophy of the Universe which has any consistency must suggest answers, at least conjectural, to such questions. No Kosmos is complete from which the question of Deity is excluded; and all knowledge has a side turned toward theology."

It is through the mastering and manifestation of this *theological* side, this Godward face, that science delivers to man its noblest messages. That which makes it something more than the gratification of an idle curiosity or a low lived utilitarianism, that which gives to it, in the thoughts of the higher-minded, a sacred dignity, is the belief that by it we are daily making clearer and clearer the ways of that Infinite Power, the features of that Divine Image, which all things shadow forth. Soon may that happy day, happy for both alike, dawn upon the world, when Religion and Science, recognizing the common grounds on which they stand, the similar methods, objects, and results which characterize each, the need they stand in of each other, the one God of whom they both prophesy, shall cordially join hands in his service!

"Above broken imperfections, above din and jar and fret there rises evermore the something higher towards which our eyes may turn, our weary feet may press. If it were not so we should be lingering in the cornfields and in the streets forever. But when we once have felt that other beauty, its desire can never again go out of our souls. And there are many ways by which we are drawn upwards."
—F. PEARD.

DEVOTIONAL READINGS.

IX.

GOD.

Sovereign God, whom men invoke under many names, and who rulest alone, it is to thee that all nations should address themselves, for we are all thy children.—*Cleanthes.*

The God of heaven and earth dwelleth not in temples made with hands; nor doth he receive service at the hands of men, as though he needed anything, since it is he that giveth to all life and breath and all things. And he hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth; that they should seek God, if haply they might feel after him and find him, though he is not far from every one of us. For in him we live and move and have our being; as some also of your own poets have said: 'We are his children.'—*Paul.*

It is of little consequence by what name you call the first Nature, the divine Reason that presides over the universe and fills all parts of it. He is still the same God.—*Seneca.*

One God and father of all, who is above all and through all and in you all.—*Paul*

Who is the God to whom we should offer sacrifice? He who gives life; he who gives strength; he whose power is proclaimed by the snowy mountain, the sea and the distant river; he through whom the sky is bright, and the earth is firm, and the heaven is established; he whose shadow is death and from whom immortality proceeds; he who is God above all gods. He is the God to whom we should offer sacrifice.—*Rig Veda.*

THERE is One Unknown Being, prior to all beings, and exalted above all. He is the Author of all things. We will sing that eternal, wise, all-perfect Love, which brought order out chaos. The empyrean, the deep Tartarus, the earth, the ocean, the immortal gods and goddesses, all that is, all that has been, and all that will be, was originally contained in his fruitful bosom. He is the first and the last, the beginning and the end. All beings derive their origin from him. He is the Primeval Father, the Life, the Cause, the Energy of all things. There is One Only Power, One Only Lord, One Universal King.—*Orpheus.*

THERE is One Universal Soul diffused through all things; eternal, invisible, unchangeable; in essence like truth, in substance resembling light; not to be represented by any image, to be comprehended

only by the mind; not, as some conjecture, exterior to the world, but in himself entire, pervading the universal sphere.—*Pythagoras.*

THERE is One Eternal God, the cause of all things. He is the Divine Mind, the Infinite Wisdom, who brought matter out of chaos into order, and produced the world we see.—*Anaxagoras.*

God is the Father of the Universe, the Creator of Nature, the Sovereign Beauty, the Supreme Good, the Ruling Mind, which orders all things, and penetrates all things. He made the heavens, the earth, and the gods. He is the Original Life and Force of all things, in the ethereal regions, upon the earth, and under the earth. He is The Being, The Unity, The Good.—*Plato.*

"YES, write it in the rock," Saint Bernard said,
"Grave it on brass with adamantine pen!
'Tis God himself becomes apparent, when
God's wisdom and God's goodness are display'd,
For God of these his attributes is made."—
Well spake the impetuous Saint, and bore of men
The suffrage captive; now, not one in ten
Recalls the obscure opposer he outweigh'd.
God's wisdom and God's goodness!—Ay, but fools
Misdefine these till God knows them no more.
Wisdom and goodness, they are God!—what schools
Have yet so much as heard this simpler lore?
This no Saint preaches, and this no Church rules;
'Tis in the desert, now and heretofore.—*Matthew Arnold.*

Nanac lay on the ground absorbed in devotion, with his feet toward Mecca. A Moslem priest seeing him, cried 'Base infidel, how darest thou turn thy feet toward the house of Allah!' Nanac answered, 'And thou, turn them, if thou canst, toward *any* spot where the awful house of God is *not.*—*Persian Tradition.*

There is one living and true God; everlasting,—without parts or passion; of infinite power, wisdom and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things. He is one, and he is beyond description. His glory is so great there can be no image of him. He is the incomprehensible spirit, who illuminates all and delights all; from whom all proceed, by whom they live after they are born, and to whom all must return. No vision can approach him, no language describe him, no intellectual power can comprehend him.—*Hindu Vedas.*

Our soundest knowledge of God is to know that we know him not as indeed he is, neither can know him, and that our safest eloquence concerning him is our silence, whereby we confess without confession that his glory is inexplicable, his greatness beyond our capacity and reach.—*Richard Hooker.*

SERIES II. **HOME LIFE.** LESSON 8.

BY MRS. SUSAN I. LESLEY AND MRS. ELIZABETH L. HEAD.

IN COMPANY.

*"A beautiful behavior is better than a beautiful form, * * * it is the finest of the fine arts."—Emerson.*

Sincerity. This is the first rule to observe in Society. Be *yourself*, do not try to imitate the *manners* or *speech*, or take up the *subjects* of others. No traits are of more value in company than *sincerity* and *simplicity*. Put your *heart* and *mind* into your conversation, and not the *small talk*, which is meaningless. Be truthful, but do not consider it sincere to say *rude* things. *Love* must bear its part in your talk, as well as *truth*, and one can be sincere and yet withhold what will give needless pain.

Self-control is most important in Society. Keep under strict guard any tendency to become *boisterous* or *excited* and if you are *witty*, do not let your desire to entertain make you forget that *smart and bright speeches often wound*. Society is for pleasure and relaxation, let your effort be therefore for gentleness, which is *restful*.

Courtesy is a necessity. Be always tender and considerate, *never exacting*. Do not think how others are treating *you*, think mainly how you shall treat others. *Perfect courtesy* includes the disinterestedness that thinks of the pleasure to be *given*, not received. Look out that every *shy*, *awkward* or *disagreeable* person, has a share in the good time. One good mother so taught her children, that when they had neglected these little social duties, she exclaimed with emphatic pathos, "Oh my children, you've *lost your opportunity*." How many are the lost opportunities of our social life! If there is awkwardness or rudeness on the part of others, it is *your chance* to be a lady or gentleman. If you *giggle* or *wink* at others or do not hasten to shield mistakes from notice, you have *lost your opportunity*. (Give here history of "Honi soit qui mal y pense." Knight and garter.)

In young company, do not join a little clique, or separate yourselves from your elders altogether, though there may be times when it is desirable. But the young need the standard of refined and peaceful manners furnished by their elders, and also the benefit of wise and superior conversation. And the elders, wearied with care, need the hilarity of young company for stimulus and cheer.

Late Hours. Do not keep them if you are young and are either a student or a worker. No girl or boy under twenty should be in company later than nine o'clock, except on the rarest occasions. Do not over-dress, it makes those who cannot, feel out of place in your society. Do not carry *the best of fun to excess*. The most innocent dancing and games become wicked when too long indulged. Do not play *kissing games*. A kiss is *too sacred* to be a plaything. Take pains to learn pleasant things that will *interest* or *divert*. Good games such as *Characters*, *Twenty Questions*, *Charades*, *Clumps* and others are both *improving* and *jovial*.

If you carry your *sincerity*, your *courtesy*, your *cheerfulness* into society, and leave behind your *moroseness*, *jealousy*, *affectation* and *rudeness*, you will help to bring about the Kingdom of God on earth, by creating a genial and kindly atmosphere, in which *Goodness becomes contagious*.—F. B. A. and S. I. L.

SERIES II. **HOME LIFE.** LESSON 7.

BY MRS. SUSAN I. LESLEY AND MRS. ELIZABETH L. HEAD.

TABLE MANNERS.

"Better is a dinner of herbs where love is, than a stalled ox, and hatred therewith."

Importance. The family, however separated at their duties and amusements, are sure to be united for a time every day at the table.

It is therefore very important that the table manners and customs, should be such as will strengthen the affectionate relations which bind them together, and render this time a source of improvement and culture.

Apparently the first object in coming together is to eat, but the act of eating is susceptible of all grades of manner, from the coarsest vulgarity to the nicest refinement. As it may be made charming and attractive, by neatness, grace, order, and consideration for others, so it may be degraded and made repulsive by slovenly haste and greediness.

Conduct. Avoid spilling food, snatching, *uncouth noises, and faces* in swallowing and chewing. As a cardinal rule, be *unostentatious* i eating. You want palatable and wholesome food in regular and sufficient quantities. Any display of your peculiar likes or dislikes is ill-mannered, For this reason, avoid discussing the food. If it is good, eat it quietly, and be thankful that bones, muscles, nerves, and brain, are to be sustained an c strengthened. If it is bad, let it alone.

Do not imagine that you can eat carelessly at home, where you "don't care," and suddenly reform when invited out. Your want of ease will betray you, as no habit is more difficult to break than that of slovenly or hasty eating—(At the discretion of the teacher, suggestions may here be made, in regard to the minutiæ of table etiquette.)

Wait especially on the aged, the guest, or those whose social position might make them unusually sensitive to neglect.

Conversation. *Happiness* and *good humor* promote digestion, while *pain* and *anger* retard it. Disagreeable topics, such as physical ailments, depressing circumstances or expectations, and fault finding however necessary at other times, should be banished from the table. Let the conversation be genial, and encouraging. Discuss plans, compare experiences and impressions. Hunt up and bring to the table, new anecdotes, new facts in history, science, and art. In a few families, some such contribution is expected from each member at every meal. Thus wise thoughts, and cheering words from without as well as within, flow into the family life, making the table a home centre of light and inspiration.

Although the old adage "Children should be seen and not heard," is fast going out of date, they should be taught never to interrupt nor speak to the exclusion of their elders. Assist, but never lead the conversation. "*I*" should not be prominent, unless by especial request. Whisperings, or mysterious allusions, rude at any time, are particularly so at the table.

Foundation. Good table manners are founded on habits of punctuality, neatness, and order, united with the hearty politeness which springs from a cheerful and kindly spirit.

They are a sure indication of social, mental, and moral culture.—E. L. H.

Notes and News.

Rev. Brooke Herford of this city has recently been preaching about the theatres, and "*to* the Theatres."

Rev. Robert Collyer is giving a series of Sunday evening sermons on English topics. Last Sunday his subject was "London." A few Sundays ago he preached a sermon on "Paying Debts." In closing, he said he would be very glad to think that some day in the future some of his hearers, who might now be in danger from the evil of which he had spoken, would sit down in their homes and say: "Well, my old minister preached a sermon about debts. It didn't seem to have any more religion in it than the Book of Esther, but it got into my heart, and what he said has staid with me from that day to this, and it did me a great deal more good than if he had preached what a great many of them call religion."

Rev. James Kay Applebee's Sunday lectures in Hooley's Theatre (in this city) will hereafter be given afternoons instead of evenings.

There is a rumor afloat the Rev. W. H. H. Murray, of Boston, is contemplating a removal to Chicago; and also that his excellent and successful *Golden Rule Weekly* becomes less successful, if not less excellent, as the *Golden Rule Monthly.*

The North Side Hebrew congregation of this city holds its services regularly under the roof of a Christian church. Now a similar case has occured in St. Louis; a Baptist congregation has lost its church by fire, and one of the Jewish Congregations has offered it the use of its synagogue. The Christianity of these Jews may well be taken as a pattern by many Christians.—*Tribune.*

A Catholic priest, Rev. B. L. Quinn, of Maywood, Ill. has just entered Meadville Theological Seminary to prepare for the Unitarian ministry.

We have just received a copy of the sermon preached by Rev. F. L. Hosmer, Jan. 12, to the Unitarians of Cleveland, on the "Place and Purpose of a Liberal Religious Society." The discourse is of a kind admirably calculated to kindle anew the faith and zeal of the liberal people of Cleveland, and make them feel that there is a real need for a Unitarian Church, and an important work for them to do that will not and can not be done by any other religious body,—a work that is nothing less than

"To build the Universal Church,
Lofty as the love of God
And ample as the wants of man."

Prof. FELIX ADLER has just been lecturing in Cincinnati on the "Rising Religion." Among the many good things he said was the following upon the subject of sincerity:

"Friends, do you wish to know my definition of religion? I will try to give it to you. It seems to me in a country like ours, in a Republic, the entire welfare of the State depends upon sincerity and honesty. Do you complain of corruption in high places; do you complain of the embezzlement of the public funds, and of the corruption of private morality? The root and core of the disease is insincerity. DE TOCQUEVILLE, a wise observer of American institutions and manners, lays stress upon the influence which religion should exercise in a Republic. Religion should be the guardian of public morality, and prevent men from going astray into the paths of dishonesty; religion should stand by our side and call out to man, 'Your salvation is in truthfulness, in perfect honesty and sincerity.' If you wish my definition of religion, I will say religion, if it is anything, is the very science of sincerity."

A corespondent sends us the following news-items from St. Louis:

Rev. Mr. HOLLAND is now preaching on Tennyson's "In memoriam."

"The second issue" of Prof. HOSMER'S "Short History of German Literature" is, I see, announced. It *must* sell, for it has the field to itself. One or two institutions have already adopted it as a text-book—*e. g.* Gannett Institute, Boston.

Since the close communion Baptists of our city accepted the Jewish Synagogue for Sunday worship, and invited Dr. ELIOT to partake of their bread and wine, Bishop ROBERTSON of the Episcopal Church has given a sociable to all the clergymen in town. It would have done your soul good to see the rival representatives of so many sects eating sponge-cake together. Possibly the "*Second Coming*" is nearer than some people think.

Rev. S. W. SAMPLE of Strawberry Point, Iowa, has received and accepted a call to the pastorate of the Unitarian church at Grand Haven, Mich.

Rev. J. N. PARDEE seems to be wide awake and actively at work in his double pastorate, at Lapeer and Charlotte, Mich. He has just concluded a series of lectures on the Old Testament at the latter place, which were listened to by large and attentive audiences. Last Sunday he gave the first of the same series at Lapeer. A liberal Conference is called to meet *at Lapeer Feb. 25th, 26th, and 27th.*

Rev. DANIEL ROWEN has resigned his charge in Jackson, Mich. and goes East. He contemplates spending the remainder of the year in the Divinity School at Harvard, and then probably taking a parish in New England. Although his stay in Jackson was of only six months duration, he had won a warm place in the affection of the Jackson people, and he leaves only because the work there was too hard for him.

Rev. J. T. SUNDERLAND lectured two evenings last week on leading doctrines of Unitarianism at Ionia, Mich. to large and appreciative audiences. The *Ionia Standard, Ionia National, Lansing Republican, Ann Arbor Register* and other papers of the State are commenting severely upon the fact that all the churches of the place were closed against him, and he had to lecture in a hall. The *Ionia National* says: "The worst feature of the case is, that a large number of those who invited Mr. SUNDERLAND here had formerly paid liberally in supporting the last Congregational minister, and to be denied the use of the church under the circumstances, is looked upon by many as an insult to the parties asking it, and to say the least, was unworthy a true christian spirit. * * When fossilized bigotry rules, true christianity hides its face. It is just that spirit which drives thousands of our best thinkers out of the churches, with bitter feelings toward its dogmatic creeds."

Mr. SUNDERLAND preaches each Sunday afternoon at Ypsilanti, a town of eight thousand inhabitants, eight miles from Ann Arbor. Ypsilanti is the seat of the State Normal School, three of whose professors are among Mr. SUNDERLAND's regular hearers.

The news having gone abroad that Rev. CALVIN STEBBINS of Detroit has resigned his pastorate, his friends in the West will be glad to learn that his society having refused to accept his resignation, he has withdrawn it. Mr. STEBBINS is to preach the opening sermon of the next Western Conference which meets in Cincinnati in May.

The *Iowa State Register* of Des Moines, for Jan. 21st, has a very pleasant notice of Rev. Mr. EFFINGER, with reports of his two sermons of the previous Sunday. It says: "Rev. Mr. EFFINGER's congregations are growing in numbers in flattering proportion as the membership of his church increases. The society, from a small beginning, having started with but a few members, is now able to present a good membership roll, comprising the names of some of the most influential and wealthy citizens of our city. Last Sunday morning the new choir, recently organized, were in their place and added much to the interest of the services."

We learn from the *Monticello Express* (Iowa) that Rev. S. S. HUNTING, of Davenport, preached in the opera house of that city Sunday morning, and evening of Jan. 19th; and a private note from Monticello reports the liberal cause there as steadily gaining strength, with the prospect, at no distant day, of being able to organize a liberal society. For this encouraging outlook large credit is due to the editor of the *Monticello Express*, a fearless and outspoken liberal, the columns of whose paper are always open to earnest and reverent liberal religious thought. Would we had more editors of secular newspapers who dare to express their real religious convictions, undeterred by the fear or the fact of losing patronage thereby.

That Rev. Mr. McCUNE whose non-denominational church at Cincinnati created such a disturbance of Presbyterian peace, is now destined to make some of the Kansas ears burn, and some of the home-missionary ears grow red all along the full length of them. This bold, bad man addressed postal cards to every Congregational pastor in Kansas, to learn what was the population of each town and what the number of churches of the Evangelical order in each city, town, or village. The replies have come in to such an extent that he now feels ready to state that the average attendance at each house of worship is fifty-six persons, and, in the opinion of his brethren, there are now 132 churches in a district which needs only fifty. That is to say, that the poor and struggling Christians of Kansas have built eighty churches more than was demanded by the Gospel. Eighty churches that were asked for not by public need, but by sectarianism.—*Alliance.*

Rev. HENRY W. BELLOWS, D. D., went to New York as pastor of All Souls Church, at the age of 24 years, and has recently celebrated the fortieth anniversary of his settlement. Two Sunday mornings, Jan. 5th and 12th, were devoted by the Doctor to an exceedingly interesting historical and auto-biographical account of these 40 eventful years. Only two clergymen in New York have been settled so long.

The latest departure in church organization is "The Woman's Church" of New York, composed of some thirty ladies formerly belonging to the scientific and religious association founded by Prof. BUCHANAN, and known as the "Psychometric Society." The new church is to be based upon religion instead of theology, their only creed being the Golden Rule.

The series of Sunday evening lectures being delivered in Washington by leading Unitarian ministers of this country, seems to meet with real success. The *Register* of Feb. 1 says: "The thronged and generous hearing given to Rev. Dr. HEDGE in his powerful introductory discourse on 'Unitarian Affirmations,' at Washington, on Sunday week, was followed last Sunday morning by another and still larger gathering, when Dr. JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE delivered his lecture on "The Bible." Pews, aisles, and areas were crowded; hundreds went away, and congressmen, judges, cabinet-officers, and divines seemed glad of standing-room while Dr. CLARKE set forth his own large view of the Bible as our inspired and inspiring helper rather than our infallible master."

Rev. Mr. REED, Swedenborgian, thinks "the end of the world" is near at hand, but it is in a spiritual, not a material sense. The *world coming to an end in a spiritual sense!* That is decidedly good!

Notes from Cambridge and Boston.—Last Monday, (Jan. 27,) at Mr. WARE's church, there was a meeting of the different Unitarian ministers of Boston. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss and forward a plan for a series of Conferences to be held in the different Unitarian churches of the city and vicinity. The object of the Conferences is to stir up the churches to more earnest work in the Unitarian cause. Thank God!

Sunday evening, Jan. 19, a revival meeting of the Unitarian sort (this is the name the *Boston Herald* gives it,) was held in the Mount Pleasant Church, Dudley St., Boston. The speakers were Revs. AMES, SHIPPEN, HALE, MAYO and Lieut.-Gov. LONG. That you may see the drift of the remarks, I will give you the key-note sentence of each speech: "What we each need is to experience religion in our own souls more fully, that we may enter the more heartily into the work for others."—AMES. "Liberalism endeavors to get at the heart of the matter, and puts the eternal emphasis on the things that touch God and destiny."—SHIPPEN. "This nation is committed through and through to Liberal Christianity by the very form of its government, which says that the majority of its people are not depraved."—HALE. "If the Church is losing its hold upon the masses, it is not because the people are leaving it, but it is drifting away from the people."—LONG.

An organization, having for its object the study of the best church music, has recently been formed in our city (Boston), under the title of "The New England Church Music Association." It is intended to form associate societies throughout New England. The association holds rehearsals every Wednesday evening. The Unitarian Church is represented by Rev. E. E. HALE, C. A. BARTOL, and others. We trust it will give an impetus to good congregational singing in our churches.

A general calm seems to pervade the religious life with us at present. The Second Church, whose late pastor was ROBERT LAIRD COLLIER, is hearing candidates. A course of lectures will be delivered this winter before the Divinity students of Cambridge College. Among the lecturers are E. E. HALE, Dr. BARTOL, FRANCIS E. ABBOTT, editor of "*The Index*, and M. J. SAVAGE." The course is under the auspices of the "Divinity School Debating Club."

The Unitarians and Universalists of Salem unite in holding meetings; also those of Beverly.

The Nation calls President ELIOT's annual report of Harvard College the most important educational document of the year.

Some of our Eastern and New York men are troubled over the fact that in the new revision I John v:7, may be omitted. Among the number are Dr. JOHN TODD and Right-Rev. ARTHUR CLEVELAND COX (print the name in full, lest the bishop faint if he see it short-

ened). Your correspondent is going to see when these men were born. He expects to find the date about A. D. 1150.

There is work done by the Unitarian Churches of Boston which is not, I imagine, as generally known as it should be. For instance: Hollis Street Church established, in its own vestry, an evening school to train boys in carving and simple carpentery. That school has long since outgrown those limits. Warren Street Chapel founded the first *evening* schools for *adults* in Boston. The school was a success. The city officials were approached on the subject but refused to establish any at public cost, it being unconstitutional. But in the end, so prosperous were the Warren Street schools, that the city had to establish others. These schools are, however, for teaching only reading, writing and arithmetic. There was need for schools of a higher grade. The Christian Unity Society (Mr. SAVAGE's) filled this gap. It established such schools, made them a success, so that the city took them up and carried them on, in its *evening* high school and free drawing schools. This if preferable to crying "Lord, Lord!" it is doing "the will of our Father."—W.

Dr. HOLLAND is indeed a thorn in the side of his orthodox readers. We know of a Presbyterian D. D who took him publicly in hand and gave him a most savage "drubbing" last Sunday, for his heretical utterance under "Topics for the Times" in the February *Scribner's*. Dr. HOLLAND's dreadful paragraphs which called down the good man's pious vengeance are in our "infidel" eyes so good that we cannot refrain from quoting them:

The whole Christian world has become incrusted with dogma and formalism. Great importance is attached to beliefs and creeds, and the essentials of Christianity, including its vital center, are almost forgotten. The Church is overloaded with superstition and nonsensical beliefs and sacred falsehoods. What is the cure for all this? The law of checks and balances has its office here, and it has begun its operation through the skepticism of the Scientists. The criticism of science was sure to come, as the necessary agent in purifying the Church of superstition and falsehood. Popery produced Luther, and the peculiar form in which Coristianity has presented itself in this later age has produced the form of infidelity now propagated by the scientists, whose work we gladly welcome as the only way out of a degrading slavery. When science shall do its perfect work, and Christianity shall be shorn of that which does not belong to it, and of that which has brought it into contempt with a world of bright men and women, then we shall have such a triumph for our religion as the world has never known. And here we call the church to witness that science has thus far taught it nothing in the uprooting of old belief that has not enlarged its ideas of God and humanity. Christianity, purified of its dross, will be a very different thing from Christianity loaded down with sanctified absurdities.

ANNOUNCEMENT FOR 1879.

The present number completes the first year of UNITY. The venture has proved a greater success than we had hoped. We shall therefore not only go on, but enlarge to nearly double the size without increasing the price. Commencing with the next number, UNITY will contain sixteen double-column pages, equivalent to about forty pages of the last year's size.

The next number will contain a paper by Rev. J. S. THOMSON, of Bloomington, on "The Cerebral Factor in Religion." In the subsequent number there will be commenced two series of papers: one on "Liberal Preachers out of the Pulpit," including the more famous living American poets and essayists; the other on the common Orthodox doctrines and the liberal interpretation of them. But the paper will aim especially to give news of persons, writings and movements having relation to the liberal work, and to give full and free expression to the best current thought on religion and social questions.

Mr. SUNDERLAND who has edited "Notes and News" the last year, has on account of his increased labor at Ann Arbor and distance from Chicago, felt obliged to ask to be relieved from future editorial work. The publishing Committee, therefore, feeling very grateful for his valuable and unremunerated services the past year, and very reluctant to have them discontinued, have done what seemed the next best thing and appointed H. M. SIMMONS of Kenosha, to edit UNITY till further notice. Among the contributors are the following: Rev. J. T. SUNDERLAND, G. W. COOKE, C. W. WENDTE, ROBERT COLLYER, J. C. LEARNED, W. C. GANNETT, JENK. LL. JONES and others. ROBERT COLLYER has promised to contribute a page of appropriate matter to each number. The Sunday School lessons and Devotional Readings will be continued as usual.

It has been found necessary with the greatly enlarged size to keep the price at $1.50; but it is the ambition and hope of the Publishing Committee to reduce the price to $1.00, as soon as the increase of subscribers warrants it. But even at the present price we expect to furnish a greater quantity of good reading matter than can be found elsewhere for the same money. All editorial communications henceforth are to be addressed to H. M. SIMMONS, Kenosha, Wis., and business letters, as heretofore, to F. L. ROBERTS, 75 Madison Street, Room 57, Chicago, Ills.

ROBERT COLLYER,
W. C. GANNETT,
JENK. LL. JONES,
C. W. WENDTE,
J. C. LEARNED,
} Publishing Committee.